

Italian Americans were excluded from California and the district I represent, San Francisco.

As with many Japanese Americans, the U.S. government deprived these Italian Americans of their civil liberties. The government prevented them from traveling far from their homes and confiscated their shortwave radios, cameras, and firearms. Historians estimate that in California, 52,000 Italian Americans were subjected to a curfew. In Boston harbor and other ports, Italian American fishermen were denied their livelihood. Despite this mistreatment, more than 500,000 Italian Americans were allowed to serve and fight in the U.S. armed forces.

To straighten the official historical record, The Wartime Violation of Italian American Civil Liberties Act would have the Department of Justice prepare and publish a comprehensive report detailing the government's unjust policies and practices during this time period. Looking ahead, this bill would require the Department to analyze how it will protect U.S. civil liberties during future national emergencies. The bill also requires the President to formally acknowledge America's failure to protect the civil liberties of Italian Americans, who were then America's largest foreign-born ethnic group.

We can never undo the injustices that were done to Italian Americans, including thousands of long term residents. We can never adequately compensate those individuals or the Italian American community. We can take steps to remember and publicize this shameful chapter of American history. We can work to ensure that every American has equal protections and equal opportunities. Too frequently in our history, our society and individuals have sought to mislabel those different from us and override the rights of these "others." This bill reminds us of our obligation to prevent the government and individuals from mislabeling and then discriminating against the "other."

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2442.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STALKING PREVENTION AND VICTIM PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1869) to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the prohibition on stalking, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1869

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stalking Prevention and Victim Protection Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF THE PROHIBITION ON STALKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2261A of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2261A. Stalking

"(a) Whoever—

"(1) for the purpose of stalking an individual, travels or causes another to travel in interstate or foreign commerce, uses or causes another to use the mail or any facility in interstate or foreign commerce, or enters or leaves, or causes another to enter or leave, Indian country; or

"(2) within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or within Indian country, stalks an individual; shall be punished as provided in section 2261.

"(b) For purposes of this section, a person stalks an individual if that person engages in conduct—

"(1) with the intent to injure or harass the individual; and

"(2) that places the individual in reasonable fear of the death of, or serious bodily injury (as defined for the purposes of section 2119) to, that individual, a member of that individual's immediate family (as defined in section 115), or that individual's intimate partner.

"(c) The court shall at the time of sentencing for an offense under this section issue an appropriate protection order designed to protect the victim from further stalking by the convicted person. Such an order shall remain in effect for such time as the court deems necessary, and may be modified, extended or terminated at any time after notice to the victim and opportunity for a hearing."

(b) DETENTION PENDING TRIAL.—Section 3156(a)(4)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or section 2261A" after "117".

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 110A of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 2261A and inserting the following:

"2261A. Stalking."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am managing this bill on behalf of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. McCOLLUM), my friend and colleague, and at this time I would like to recognize his leadership on this bill and also the leadership of the chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

□ 1715

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I do rise at this time in support of H.R. 1869, the

Stalking Prevention and Victim Protection Act of 1999.

The bill was introduced by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), and this bill has been the result of 4 years of hard labor on behalf of the gentlewoman from New York. She recognized that presently we have over 1 million women in this country that are being stalked, we have about 400,000 men, and we have hundreds of thousands of children that are now being stalked because of the Internet.

The full Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported the bill as amended by voice vote. The goals of the bill are to expand the reach of the Federal stalking statute to prosecute cyberstalkers who are currently beyond the reach of Federal law enforcement but are deserving of Federal prosecution, and to better protect stalking victims by authorizing pretrial detention for alleged stalkers, and mandating the issuing of a civil protection order against convicted stalkers.

These goals are worthwhile, and these goals will give Federal prosecutors the tools they need to prosecute stalkers who might otherwise not be prosecuted at the State and local level.

That said, let me emphasize that the vast majority of stalking cases are, and even after this legislation passes, will be prosecuted at the State and local level. This legislation does not in any way seek to federalize stalking crimes. What it does do is that it will help Federal prosecutors respond to predatory stalking behavior that under current law is beyond the reach of State and local officials because of cyberstalking.

The bill would make several significant changes or additions to current law. I would like to go over those at this time.

First, it would reach stalkers who use the mail or any facility in interstate or foreign commerce to stalk their victims. A lot of times, that is the Internet. Under current law, Federal jurisdiction over stalking crimes is triggered only when a stalker actually crosses State lines physically with the intent to injure or harass a person, and his conduct places that person in reasonable fear of death or bodily injury.

So Members can see from that definition, it would not include someone stalking by use of the mail or the Internet, because they would not physically cross a State line.

This bill actually just brings us into the electronic age, and is long overdue. The physical travel requirements preclude the Federal prosecution of stalkers who use other means of interstate communication, such as mail or the Internet, to threaten or harass their victims. With the explosive growth of the Internet and other telecommunication technologies, there is evidence of cyberstalking. Stalking using advanced communication technologies is

becoming a serious problem. I am sure the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) will speak further to that.

The second thing this bill does, Mr. Chairman, it will require that a Federal court, when sentencing a defendant convicted of stalking, that it issue a protective order to protect the victim from further stalking prior to the trial.

Unfortunately, some stalkers remain interested in their targets for years, even after they have been prosecuted, convicted, and incarcerated for stalking. A civil protection order would permit a Federal court to maintain jurisdiction over the convicted stalker after the completion of the sentence imposed by the crime, both to reduce the threat of future stalking by the defendant, and to provide an enforcement mechanism should the order be violated. That is the probation order, in most cases, or the protective order.

The suspension document presently before the House contains a modification to the protection order language, specifically to paragraph C of what will be the new 18 U.S. Code Section 2261(a).

Concern was expressed with the reported version of the bill that protective orders might continue in force in perpetuity, long after any need for them. The suspension document addresses that problem by assuring that a Federal court will have the discretion to craft a protective order to fit the circumstances of each case.

The new language reads that such an order "shall remain in effect for such time as the court deems necessary, and may be modified, extended, or terminated at any time after notice to the victim and an opportunity for a hearing."

Third, the bill would permit a Federal court to order the detention of an alleged stalking defendant pending trial in order to assure the safety of the victim and the community, as well as the defendant's appearance at trial.

This is because of one simple fact. This is that fact, that stalking victims run a higher risk of being assaulted or even killed by a stalker immediately after the criminal justice system intervenes; that is, just after the stalker is arrested and then released on bond, prior to trial.

Mr. Speaker, it was only 9 years ago that the first anti-stalking statute was passed in California. Since that time, all 50 States have enacted stalking statutes in one form or another. Congress passed the first Federal stalking statute in 1996. This bill would be the first amendment to that statute since it was enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill will give Federal prosecutors better tools to more effectively prosecute interstate stalking in cyberstalking cases and to better protect the victims of those crimes and the community.

I urge all my colleagues to support the bill as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to manage this bill on behalf of my friend and my colleague from Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and want to recognize his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1869, the "Stalking Prevention and Victim Protection Act of 1999." The bill was introduced by Representative SUE KELLY and has bipartisan support. The Full Judiciary Committee favorably reported the bill, as amended, by a voice vote.

The goals of the bill are to expand the reach of the Federal stalking statute to prosecute cyber stalkers who are currently beyond the reach of federal law enforcement but are deserving of federal prosecution, and to better protect stalking victims by authorizing pretrial detention for alleged stalkers and mandating the issuance of civil protection orders against convicted stalkers. I believe these goals are worthwhile. I believe we should give federal prosecutors the tools they need to prosecute stalkers who might otherwise not be prosecuted at the state and local level. That said, let me emphasize that the vast majority of stalking cases are, and if this legislation passes, will continue to be, prosecuted at the state and local level. This legislation does not seek to federalize stalking crimes. But H.R. 1869, as amended, will help federal prosecutors respond to predatory stalking behavior that, under current law, is beyond their reach—like cyberstalking.

The bill would make several significant changes or additions to current law. First, it would reach stalkers who use the mail or any facility in interstate or foreign commerce to stalk their victims. Under current law, Federal jurisdiction over a stalking crime is triggered only when a stalker travels across a state line with the intent to injure or harass a person and his conduct places that person in reasonable fear of death or bodily injury.

The physical travel requirement precludes the federal prosecution of stalkers who use other means of interstate communication—such as the mail or the Internet—to threaten or harass their victims. With the explosive growth of the Internet and other telecommunications technologies, there is evidence that cyberstalking—stalking using advanced communications technologies—is becoming a serious problem.

Second, H.R. 1869 would require that a Federal court, when sentencing a defendant convicted of stalking, issue a protection order to protect the victim from further stalking. Unfortunately, some stalkers remain interested in their targets for years, even after they have been prosecuted, convicted, and incarcerated for stalking. A civil protection order would permit a Federal court to maintain jurisdiction over a convicted stalker after the completion of the sentence imposed for the crime, both to reduce the threat of future stalking by the defendant and to provide an enforcement mechanism should the order be violated.

The suspension document presently before the House contains a modification to the protection order language—specifically, to paragraph (c) of what would be the new 18 U.S.C. section 2261A. Concern was expressed with the reported version of the bill that protection orders might continue in force in perpetuity, long after any need for them. The suspension document addresses that problem by assuring

that a Federal court will have the discretion to craft a protection order to fit the circumstances of the case. The new language reads that such an order "shall remain in effect for such time as the court deems necessary, and may be modified, extended or terminated at any time after notice to the victim and an opportunity for a hearing."

Third, H.R. 1869 would permit a Federal court to order the detention of an alleged stalking defendant pending trial in order to assure the safety of the victim and the community as well as the defendant's appearance at trial. Stalking victims run a higher risk of being assaulted or even killed by the stalker immediately after the criminal justice system intervenes—that is, just after the stalker is arrested and then released on bail.

Mr. Speaker, it was only nine years ago that the first anti-stalking statute was passed in California. Since then, all 50 States have enacted stalking statutes of one form or another. Congress passed the first federal stalking law in 1996. H.R. 1869 would be the first amendment to that statute since it was enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill will give Federal prosecutors better tools to more effectively prosecute interstate stalking and cyberstalking cases and to better protect the victims of these crimes. I urge all my colleagues to support the bill as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS); the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM); the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), as well as the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), for working with us in preparing this bill for presentation today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this anti-stalking bill, as amended, provides valuable additional tools to law enforcement in preventing the crime of stalking and the dreadful impact it has on its victims.

The first anti-stalking bill was passed in California approximately 9 years ago, and since then all 50 States have enacted anti-stalking statutes. Congress passed its first anti-stalking law in 1996. This bill, H.R. 1869, as filed, broadened the present Federal jurisdiction and gives Federal authorities more tools in getting at stalking. The gentleman from Alabama has outlined the provisions in the bill as we will consider them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the bill, as amended, addresses concerns about several of the initial provisions, including the bail provisions, protective orders, and jurisdictional and criminal intent language.

Mr. Speaker, while I had reservations about H.R. 1869 in its original form, I now enthusiastically support it. I want

to thank those involved for their willingness to address those concerns. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the fine work the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) did on this bill, and express our appreciation on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman MCCOLLUM) for the gentleman's fine work on this bill. I think this is a great example of a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who is the architect of this bill, and as I said, it represents the culmination of 4 years of labor on her part.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in support of the Stalking Prevention and Victim Protection Act, legislation I introduced to strengthen the current Federal anti-stalking statute. Although stalking is not a new phenomenon, it is certainly one we have only recently identified as a distinct and troubling societal affliction.

Just 10 years ago, not one State in the Union had on its books a law designed to criminalize the insidious behavior of human predators who devote themselves to the haunting and harassment of others.

Though we will probably never be able to fully stop or comprehend the behavior of those driven by delusions and personal demons, it is our responsibility to do all that we can to assist the millions of stalking victims in our country.

In the last 10 years, lawmakers across the land have acknowledged this responsibility. As it stands now, there is not one State that does not have an anti-stalking statute on its books. We have responded at the Federal level, as well. Three years ago, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) shepherded through Congress the International Stalking Punishment and Prevention Act, the first Federal anti-stalking statute.

This provision makes it a crime for any person to travel across State lines with the intent to injure or harass another person, thereby placing that person or a member of that person's family in reasonable fear of death or serious bodily injury. This was landmark legislation that was an important first step to our effort.

I come to the House floor today to continue that effort. In considering the proposal before us, we ought to be guided not so much by memories of high profile cases of celebrity stalking, but rather by an increasing awareness that stalking is a commonplace circumstance affecting millions of Ameri-

cans. It is my hope to help these millions who have not the resources to co-opt themselves from mainstream society as celebrities do.

The Justice Department has estimated that over 1 million women and over 370,000 men are currently stalked every year. They further estimate that one out of every 12 women and one out of every 45 men has been stalked at some point in their lives.

In light of these projections, a reassessment of the current Federal law must yield a conclusion that modifications should be made. My proposal seeks to build on current law by addressing the definition of stalking, which addresses only traveling over interstate lines. This new definition works by including those avenues of communication we are addressing in this area believed by many experts to be the most vulnerable medium to an increased rate of stalking in the coming years, the Internet.

Though its magnitude is unknown at this point, a report on cyberstalking released just 2 months ago by the Justice Department concluded that there may be potentially tens or even hundreds of thousands of victims of recent cyberstalking in the United States. Because of its ostensibly anonymous, nonconfrontational nature, many are concerned that stalking over e-mail and the Internet will increase as more Americans gain access to this exciting new communications tool.

By acting now, we will impose a serious disincentive to stalkers who consider using technological capabilities to inflict harassment and fear.

My proposal also seeks to provide additional protections to stalking victims by stipulating that a protection order be issued at the time of sentencing, and by specifying that there be a presumption against bail in cases where the accused has a previous history of stalking offenses.

I think all of my colleagues would agree that this body has no directive more important than the one which guides us to work each day to improve the lives of Americans. Though perhaps in the grand scheme of our efforts this measure may be very small, it nevertheless carries great significance to those Americans across the country whose basic daily freedoms are contaminated and crippled by an undaunted menace.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this proposal.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, in my opening statement on this bill, I mentioned that California passed the first law, the first anti-stalking statute of all the United States. I also mentioned the Federal statute that this body passed.

I am very pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who is the author of both of those bills, the Cali-

fornia statute and the first Federal statute.

□ 1730

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, which is the Stalking Prevention and the Victim Protection Act. In 1990, I was the author of the first antistalking law in the country. That came about at a time when there was a 6-week period in which four young women in my county of Orange County, California, were each told that they were going to be killed. And each one informed law enforcement and law enforcement, unfortunately, had to tell them there was nothing that they can do until they were physically attacked.

One police officer told me the worst thing he ever had to do in his life was to try to apprehend that stalker in the act, and he almost succeeded. Unfortunately, the young woman lost her life. She was killed just before the apprehension of the stalker was made.

So all four of these young women who knew they were going to be killed, who told law enforcement, who told their friends that this was going to happen to them lost their lives in the span of 6 weeks.

That was the impetus for the bill. Today, all 50 States have antistalker laws on their books. When I came to Congress, I felt that there was need for a Federal law. Why? Because in the case of restraining orders between the States, there is a situation where those restraining orders often are lost when the victim moves from one State to another State. Why does the victim do that? Because they are told by victim witness programs get away from the stalker. And when they try to do that, they lose the protections under the law.

So the Federal antistalker law protected those victims. But now we have a new type of stalking which has come to the fore, and this bill which was prompted by a Justice Department report on the frequency and the seriousness of cyberstalking, will do something about that. It is going to tighten Federal antistalking law to include threats through the Internet, threats through regular mail, and with the passage of this bill, victims of this crime will have further legal recourse. They are going to have an increased sense of security.

I talked to one young woman who was stalked for 14 years by a young man she did not even know. He watched her when she was on the high school track team. He began following her, stalking her, threatening her, and there was nothing, again, that law enforcement could do at the time. It culminated with a standoff on her front doorstep for 12 hours with police. He had tried to abduct her with a knife to her throat.

Mr. Speaker, these are instances where these individuals let their intent

be known. They publish their threats against these victims. There is no reason why we cannot let law enforcement act upon those threats before it is too late, before these victims lose their lives. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who we learned today had three brothers that fought in World War II.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for yielding me this time, and thank him for his leadership on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for his work on this; and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) in absentia; indeed, the prime sponsor, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), for it.

And, sure, I have three brothers who served in wartime and what we are trying to do with this legislation is to prevent some of the wars that are going on with the stalking.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the statistic that in 1997, the Department of Justice report concluded that 1 million women and 370,000 men are stalked every year. This greatly exceeds any expectations or estimates. And, indeed, it continues to increase, from what we understand.

According to the National Center for Victims of Crime, there is no definitive psychological or behavior profile for stalkers, which makes the effort to devise effective antistalking strategies very difficult. I must say, with all of our advances in technology, technology itself has allowed for additional opportunity for stalking.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why I think this bill is so very important. We heard from the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) about the origin, the genesis of the first stalking law that we had. It is time now that we alter it. It is time now that we go beyond the current DOJ model antistalking code that was released in 1993 and the legislation enacted in 1996.

So what this bill does is it alters the current antistalking legislation by expanding the Federal prohibition on stalking. And what it does that I think is so important, it broadens the Federal definition of stalking to include interstate commerce, which can include e-mail, telephone, and other forms of interstate communications as a means of stalking.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention also that it adds new provisions, which have already been stated, with regard to bail restrictions and protection orders at the time of sentencing.

We in government must do all that we can to protect our citizenry from

stalking and to show it is against the law. H.R. 1869 helps us mightily to do so. It deserves passage.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for sponsoring the bill. I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for his kind remarks, because we in fact did resolve several concerns about the bill constructively and today the bill should enjoy broad bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, law enforcement agencies have said that this bill is necessary for them to protect the citizens who are their charge to protect. The National Center for Victims of Crime has given a strong endorsement to this bill. Sometimes here we become cynical, but I can honestly say that this legislation that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) has brought before us will make America a safer place and will protect many Americans from unnecessarily being stalked. I simply would like to again give my thanks to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), and to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), who drafted the underlying legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, a recent study by the National Institute of Justice found that stalking is a crime that will victimize far too many in this country: 8% of American women and 2% of American men will be stalked in their lifetimes. In fact, 1.4 million Americans are stalked every year.

While I am pleased that we have been able to work with the majority to craft a stalking bill that strikes the correct balance between the need to protect stalking victims and the constitutional due process rights of all accused persons, I am disappointed that we are still addressing domestic violence issues in fits and starts.

The Violence Against Women Act of 1999, H.R. 37, which I have sponsored and which has 175 co-sponsors, addresses the continuing problem of domestic violence in a comprehensive fashion. H.R. 357 goes beyond merely expanding the federal definition of stalking and would reauthorize the important programs to stop sexual assault and domestic violence that Congress funded in the 1994 Violence Against Women Act. H.R. 357 would also build on the good work we did in 1994 and expand funding to other areas such as violence against children, sexual assault prevention, domestic violence prevention, violence against women in the military system, and many others.

Stalking is a serious problem that deserves our attention, but we cannot shut our eyes to the broader problems of domestic violence.

Studies show that women and girls annually experience approximately 960,000 incidents of assault, rape, and murder at the hands of a current or former spouse or intimate partner.

It is ironic, indeed, that we had people on the other side of the aisle decrying violence against fetuses several weeks ago, but they have still been unable to hold hearings on H.R. 357, which addresses domestic violence against women, children, and men.

I am happy that H.R. 1869 will allow for prosecution of stalking where a stalker transmits a threatening communication over the telephone, through the mail, or by email. I also support provisions in the bill that make it clear that at the time of sentencing, the court should issue an appropriate protective order designed to protect the victim from further stalking by the convicted person. Under the bill, this order will remain in effect for as long as the court deems it necessary in order to prevent the stalking victim from being harassed after the person is released from prison.

In addition, we have seen far too many instances where an arrest will not make a stalker stop threatening a victim or will even result in a stalker escalating his stalking to a point that is life-endangering to the victim. While I certainly believe that everyone is innocent until proven guilty and that bail should be granted to the accused in as many cases as possible, it is also necessary in certain cases to detain alleged stalkers before trial. By defining stalking as a "crime of violence" under our criminal laws, H.R. 1869 will permit a federal court to detain an alleged stalker pending trial in order to assure the safety of the community or the defendant's appearance at trial.

While I applaud these changes in our stalking laws, we still need to do more. I encourage Congress to make this stalking bill only the first step in a broader battle against domestic violence. We should hold hearings on H.R. 357 and, at a minimum, continue the good work we began in the 1994 Violence Against Women Act, by reauthorizing those programs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support The Stalking Prevention and Victim Protection Act that seeks to prevent the criminal act of stalking and to protect the rights of victims. Stalking is a very serious issue that deserves the full attention of this Committee and of Congress.

Each year, 1.4 million Americans are stalked. Of this number over 79% of adult stalking victims are women, and 59% of female stalking victims are stalked by a current or former intimate partner. In 80% of those cases, the victim was physically assaulted. The increasing number of these stalking cases have prompted increased attention as to significant impact stalking has on our society.

In addition to the statistics I have just recited, the Justice Department's Bureau of Justice Statistics cites that one in 12 women will be stalked at some point in their lives. However, of this high number of women who have been stalked or will be stalked in their lifetime, only 28% of these female victims will attain restraining orders against their stalkers. In recognition of the high percentage of stalking cases occurring yearly, unprecedented interest in stalking over the past decade, and increased media accounts of stalking victims,

anti-stalking laws have been passed in all 50 States and the District of Columbia which have further been supplemented the Violence Against Women's Act and the Interstate Stalking Punishment and Prevention Act of 1996.

Mr. Speaker, hearings held within the Judiciary Committee have revealed that stalking is a much bigger problem than previously assumed and should be treated as a major criminal justice problem and public health concern. Stalkers often do not threaten their victims verbally or in writing; therefore, many groups have recommended that credible threat requirements should be eliminated from anti-stalking statutes to make it easier to prosecute such cases. This bill would address these concerns and provide adequate protection to the potential victims.

I commend the sponsors of this legislation and urge my colleagues to support final passage of this bill.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1869, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCTIC TUNDRA HABITAT EMERGENCY CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2454) to assure the long-term conservation of mid-continent light geese and the biological diversity of the ecosystem upon which many North American migratory birds depend, by directing the Secretary of the Interior to implement rules to reduce the overabundant population of mid-continent light geese.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 5, after line 24, insert:

SEC. 4. COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the end of the period described in section 103(b), the Secretary shall prepare, and as appropriate implement, a comprehensive, long-term plan for the management of mid-continent light geese and the conservation of their habitat.

(b) REQUIRED ELEMENTS.—The plan shall apply principles of adaptive resource management and shall include—

(1) a description of methods for monitoring the levels of populations and the levels of harvest of mid-continent light geese, and recommendations concerning long-term harvest levels;

(2) recommendations concerning other means for the management of mid-continent light goose populations, taking into account the reasons for the population growth specified in section 102(a)(3);

(3) an assessment of, and recommendations relating to, conservation of the breeding habitat of mid-continent light geese;

(4) an assessment of, and recommendations relating to, conservation of native species of wildlife adversely affected by the overabundance of mid-continent light geese, including the species specified in section 102(a)(5); and

(5) an identification of methods for promoting collaboration with the government of Canada, States, and other interested persons.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2002.

Page 6, line 1, strike out “SEC. 4.” and insert “SEC. 5.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are once again considering H.R. 2454, the Arctic Tundra Habitat Conservation Act. This bipartisan legislation addresses the devastating impact that an exploding population of snow geese, also known as light geese, is having on the fragile Canadian Arctic Tundra.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief. I would like to say that this bill was debated and reported from the subcommittee. It was debated and reported from the full Committee on Resources. It was debated here on the floor and passed by a voice vote. It went to the Senate, where an amendment was added to provide for some long-term strategies relative to this subject and is back here for concurrence.

This is an essential stopgap measure that is supported by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, by Ducks Unlimited, by the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, by the National Audubon Society, by the National Rifle Association, the Wildlife Management Institute, and the Wildlife Legislative Fund for America.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my sincere appreciation to Senator Spencer ABRAHAM for his assistance in moving this important proposal. I am confident that early next year we will have a full debate on the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act. This was an excellent measure that was introduced by Senator ABRAHAM and the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), our full committee chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an “aye” vote and I anticipate no further speakers on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as always, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, for his leadership and for bringing this legislation now for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes our best efforts to restore wildlife populations create unintended consequences and that seems to be the unfortunate case with mid-continent light geese. According to biologists inside and outside of the Federal Government, the population of light geese has exploded over the past decade. This has caused substantial destruction to fragile Arctic and sub-Arctic habits.

Indisputably, human actions are partly to blame for the growth of the light geese population. And for better or worse, human actions will be pivotal to the future control of these migratory birds.

H.R. 2454, the Arctic Tundra Habitat Emergency Conservation Act basically authorizes two emergency regulations that were proposed earlier this year by the Fish and Wildlife Service. These emergency measures were strongly supported by State wildlife management agencies and a broad assortment of private wildlife and conservation organizations, including Ducks Unlimited and the National Audubon Society.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of our Committee on Resources, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) have agreed to include an expiration date of May 15, 2001, or earlier if the service files its final environmental impact statement before that date, to limit the duration of this emergency action. I am also pleased to see that the Senate amended the bill to require the Fish and Wildlife Service to develop and implement a comprehensive management plan for mid-continent light geese and their habitats.

We have also come to recognize in the version of H.R. 2454 that was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Environmental and Public Works included a second title that would have authorized a program for the conservation and management of neotropical migratory birds. But considering the changes that have been made to the bill in the committee and by the Senate, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the bill has been sufficiently narrowed to limit excessive light geese mortality while the Fish and Wildlife Service